Do not hate these qualities—illumination, action, and delusion—when they appear, nor long for them when they disappear. —*The Bhagavad-Gita*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 53 DECEMBER, 1964 NUMBER 2

THE EMERGING SELF

FOR the student of Theosophy one of the deeply engrossing developments in modern thought is the almost sudden popularity of the idea of the "self" and of the importance of "self-knowledge." While the context of this development is the practice of psychotherapy, no fruitful idea which gains currency in the psychological sciences long remains a possession of the specialists. Writers soon pick up the conceptions which preoccupy psychologists and make them the themes of novels and other literary forms. This was true of the Freudian movement, which led to the "psychological novel," and the idea of self-understanding already has a well-established place in literature, often being spoken of as the "quest for identity."

This turning inward of scientists concerned with understanding man is one more instance of the progressive alignment of scientific investigation in almost a Theosophic direction. The reader who has volumes of this Magazine going back to the 1920's and 1930's will have no difficulty in seeing that a radical change has occurred in the orientation of scientific thought during the past forty years. Reference to the pages of On the Lookout in the 1920's shows that the science of that period was properly called "materialistic," and the Theosophical teachings were obviously against the grain of established opinion at that time. Today, by contrast, there is almost a surfeit of material containing ideas in harmony with Theosophical teachings. A ripening of the century's thought seems to be in progress, with philosophical attitudes becoming the rule rather than the

exception, and Lookout, instead of treating items for comment as spokesman for an embattled minority of Theosophical opinion, now has the task of drawing attention to encouraging signs and pointing out various differences and distinctions.

On this matter of contemporary interest in the idea of the Self, it is of some value to take note of differences in approach. The student of Theosophy has two sources for his reflections on the question. He has the rich store of metaphysical teachings in the philosophy, and he has what he can garner from observation of the subtleties of his own inner life. Then, in addition, he has the counsels of the devotional books and the bearing on all his thinking of the great ethical principles which qualify and illuminate all intellectual conclusions.

This you might call the "classical" approach to self-knowledge. The path of self-discovery, as spoken of in the Theosophical teachings, is the same path that is described in ancient versions of the Wisdom-Religion. From the days of Sankaracharya to the present, the search for the Self has been spoken of in much the same terms. The present-day student can pick up the *Crest Jewel of Wisdom* or the earlier *Bhagavad-Gita* and find no dated or antiquarian flavor in what he reads. The counsels are framed by the majestic metaphysics of the Secret Doctrine and the reader feels at home.

The modern psychotherapist, or the man who, stirred by the growing luminosity of recent psychological investigations, turns to personal wondering about the self, does not have these advantages. Yet his quest is sometimes animated by a compensating intensity. He may feel an overwhelming longing, born of personal suffering, to understand himself. He lacks the philosophical charts, but he has the will to know. So it must be, at any rate, that the Theosophical student with increasing frequence comes upon the work of such people with an authentic sense of discovery. The man has repeated some ancient sacramental truth, yet in words which are manifestly his own. He has, in this instance, drunk at the same well as even the teachers of Theosophy.

One does not find the truth "whole," of course, by such means. Nor is the momentary insight of an individual any substitute for Theosophy. But in such passages lies evidence of that very unity of the One Self of which the teachers speak, and which too often remains an abstraction, an idea in which one has "faith," instead of being a confirmed verity.

And just because there is absence of metaphysical distinction, little if any training in the practice of impersonal thought, and no over-arching philosophical symmetry such as *The Secret Doctrine* provides, in the minds of these discoverers, the framework of discourse in which the insight is embedded may be flawed by misconception, or it may lead to a kind of special pleading against which the entire fraternity of Theosophical teachers unmistakably warns.

These things are possible, even likely, and yet the modern yearning after self-knowledge and self-discovery remains an enormously encouraging and even inspiring current. For here, on independent lines, is revealed a strong karmic tendency, not of the Theosophical movement, but of the world.

Conceivably, the thought of the world moves in great curves, from century to century. The climactic hour of each centenary cycle, we are told, comes in the last twenty-five years. We might think of this period as a time when the curve of the world's thought gradually becomes tangent to, and finally touches and becomes one with, the line of Theosophical endeavor. This is the "Tidal Wave" of which H.P.B. wrote, using such men as Dostoevsky and Tolstoy to illustrate the rising intellectuality and intuitive perceptions which occurred during the last century. The coincidence of the two lines, we may think, produces an extraordinary opportunity for the teachers, and a like opportunity for the world to experience the enrichment which only such teachers can provide.

In the past, the themes of the conjunction have been various. In the eighteenth century, they reflected conceptions of the nature of man which subsequently appeared in the great political documents and manifestoes of the Age of Revolution. These ideas were a kind of self-knowledge, but cast in a form which grew in meaning mostly in terms of social application.

Today, a more fundamental awakening seems on the way. Men are now reaching after the deepest secrets of their being, turning toward the heart of their high quality as egos, thinkers, and envisioners. Theosophists may come to stand in awe of the depth and dimensions of independent discovery, before the cycle ends; and yet, at the same time, they may find a scope for use of what they have learned and understood, in behalf of a rousing and hungrily inquiring mankind, such that all their lonely efforts, all their plodding exercises and persistent preparations will seem repaid far beyond any ordinary hope.

MISUNDERSTOOD BIBLICAL TRADITIONS

Mercy—I

EMOTIONS and conditions such as love and hate, anger and self-control, light and dark, freedom and bondage, etc., ad infinitum, appear to be ingredients in every type of human experience. Without the presence of the "pairs of opposites," human perception would not be possible. Where is the individual who could describe the nature of any object without the qualifying characteristics of large and small, hard and soft, pretty and ugly, or whole and part? Who could appreciate, or even understand, the whole or ignoble character of any friend or acquaintance without recourse to the dual attributes of wise and foolish, cheerful and morose, moral and debased, or merciful and cruel? All human experience, it would seem, grows out of and actually depends upon these inescapable *dualities*—dualities, moreover, which are ever-shifting, ever-shading, one into the other—each side of the pair having existence, apparently, only in relationship to its other half. The *opposites,* we say, are essential to all forms of *human* thought and experience. *Are they also qualities of Deity?*

The subject of mercy naturally falls into three general divisions or categories: (1) in its connection with Deity; (2) in its relationship to Justice; and (3) as an attribute of Man.

The first question of whether mercy is an attribute of Deity, of whether God loves and hates, or feels jealousy and revenge, is one that has been taken up and discussed by almost every ancient and modern school of religious and philosophical thought. In some instances, it has been made the issue underlying deep ecclesiastical disunity. Many early Christian philosophers, among whom there seems to have prevailed far greater freedom of thought and expression than exists today, grappled strenuously with this question. And though the rise of dogmatism served to implant in the race mind the notion that the problem no longer exists, or has been solved, it continues to arise and to plague the thoughts of serious minds.

The pivotal point of the problem seems to be the concept men hold as to the nature of Deity—whether, as some individuals believe,

God is a *personal Being,* with attributes similar to those of man, or whether, as held by others, Deity is an *impersonal* Divine Essence or Presence, above and beyond all qualities. To the former class of believers, the very presence in life of such qualities as love, mercy, intelligence, truth, and justice seems proof patent of the existence of a *personal* God. If God were not a personal Being, it is argued, there could be no such qualities as love and mercy. And the proponents of this view point to the Scriptures to substantiate their belief. In the Koran, the Holy Writ of Islam, for example, each of its 114 chapters, with the single exception of the ninth, begins with the phrase: "In the name of God, the Merciful One." In the Old Testament, the Bible of the Jews, many of the prophets and psalmists sing unending songs of praise to the "merciful God" in heaven.

> For the Lord thy God is a merciful God. (Deut. 4:31.)
>
> For the Lord is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations. (Ps. 100:5.)
>
> . . . : for his mercy endureth forever. (Ps. 136:1.)

Except for God's mercy, according to the Judeo-Christian tradition, it is not likely that either heaven or earth would have been created, or life breathed into the inert form of man. Except for the merciful hand of God, races and nations could not have come into being, nor could cities, towns and villages have been populated and become great and prosperous. It is due to the mercy of the Lord that the Sun shines and fructifies the seeds of the earth, and that every living creature is endowed with the power to bring forth each its kind. The strength and wisdom of man, his health and good fortune, they teach, are his for no other reason than that God, as a personal Being, seated upon his throne in heaven, looks with pity and compassion upon the object of his creation. It is due to the goodness of God that the afflicted are not more afflicted, or the desolate more desolate. All of man's efforts, except for the tender mercy of the Lord, would be vain, and death and everlasting woe would be his lot. "The earth, O Lord, is filled with thy mercy." (Ps. 119:64.) Such is the view which, for many centuries, has dominated the mind of the major portion of the Western world.

The early Christian Gnostics, who flourished in the first and second centuries of our era, held radically different views concerning the nature of both God and man. Instead of the *personal* God idea, which makes of Deity the Creator and man the "creature," they taught that God is an impersonal divine Essence, or Presence, sepa-

rate from no part of life, but immanent in the Whole. Everything, in its essential nature, they held, *is* God—thus endowing all life potentially with the nature, stature and dignity of Godhood. The medieval Kabalists, both Jewish and Christian, taught the same, and said that God sleeps in the stone, stirs in the plant, dreams in the animal, wakes in the human being, and only in Perfected Man, in the Christ or Buddha, does God know self to be the ALL. Like the advocates of the personal God idea, the Gnostics too were able to point to Scripture in support of their views—not only to the Bible, but to Greek, Egyptian and Buddhist writings.

Thus, in the Bible, Deity is held to be "infinite" in understanding (Ps. 147:5); "eternal" (Heb. 9:14); "immortal" (1 Tim. 1:17); and "immutable" (Mal. 3:6)—utterly incomprehensible, in other words, to finite human minds. The designations *infinite,* not subject to space; *eternal,* not subject to time; *immortal,* not subject to decay; and *immutable,* not subject to change, it is interesting to note, are all *negative* terms, and they serve rather to express what God is *not* than to make positive affirmation of what God *is*. No great spiritual teacher or prophet, in any of the religious systems, has ever attempted to define the Spirit. Thus, Gautama Buddha is quoted as saying:

> Om Amitaya! measure not with words
> Th' Immeasurable; nor sink the string of thought
> Into the Fathomless. Who asks doth err,
> Who answers, errs. Say nought!
>
> The Books teach Darkness was, at first of all,
> And Brahm, sole meditating in that Night:
> Look not for Brahm and the Beginning there!
> Nor him, nor any light
>
> Shall any gazer see with mortal eyes,
> Or any searcher know by mortal mind;
> Veil after veil will lift—but there must be
> Veil upon veil behind.
>
> (*The Light of Asia.*)

Following the tradition of her predecessors, H. P. Blavatsky likewise refused to define Deity, but presented for the consideration of serious minds Three Fundamental Propositions, the first of which posits:

> An Omnipresent, Eternal, Boundless, and Immutable PRINCIPLE on which all speculation is impossible, since it transcends

> the power of human conception and could only be dwarfed by any human expression or similitude. It is beyond the range and reach of thought—in the words of Mandukya, "unthinkable and unspeakable." There is one absolute Reality which antecedes all manifested, conditioned, being . . . the rootless root of "all that was, is, or ever shall be." It is of course devoid of all attributes and is essentially without any relation to manifested, finite Being. It is "Be-ness" rather than Being (in Sanskrit, *Sat*), and is beyond all thought or speculation . . . (*The Secret Doctrine* I, 14.)

The Theosophists, then, like the Buddhists and Christian Gnostics, do not speculate upon THAT which is incomprehensible. Bowing in silent reverence before the awful mystery of the ABSOLUTE, they postulate almost endless series of Hierarchies of Intelligent Beings, or lesser Gods—the "creators," so to say, of both heaven and earth. And some of these Beings, or lesser Gods, Theosophy teaches, are grander by far, infinitely more merciful and compassionate than the highest conception a human being may hold of a *personal God*—only they are not Deity, the Absolute and Unconditioned ALL. Other of the lower deities, like the Greek Nemesis and the Jewish Jehovah, are sometimes filled with wrath and fury—the embodiments, really, of the Karmic retribution of the races, nations, families, and individuals to whom they are related.

Just as the seven colors of the spectrum emanate from the One White Light, which is *no* color, so, according to Theosophy, the seven Hierarchies, or Elohim, of which Jehovah is one, emanate from the ONE TRUE DEITY, which possesses no attributes. Herein, say the Theosophists, is to be found one of the keys to deeper insights into the Bible. The term "God," as there used, has been made to apply indiscriminately to both the SUPREME DEITY and to any one or several of the Hierarchies, or lesser Elohim—thus making for confusion more confounded. The term Elohim, according to the Editors of the *Oxford Cyclopedic Concordance,* and as all Hebrew scholars know, "is a plural name." "It occurs," they say, "more than 2500 times [in the Bible], and is always translated *God* in the English versions" (page 147). The first sentence in Genesis, therefore, instead of containing the word "God," should read: "In the beginning the Elohim [plural] created the heaven and the earth." And is this rendering not supported by the statement in Genesis 3:22, where "the Lord God [Elohim] said, Behold, the man has become as one of *us* [plural]"?

According to the same Oxford authorities, I Kings 18:39, instead

of reading as it now does: "The LORD, he is the God," should be made to read: "Jehovah, he is the Elohim." In like manner, Deut. 10:17, instead of reading: "For the LORD your God is God of gods," should be made to read: "For the Lord your Jehovah is Elohim of Elohim"—probably meaning to imply that Jehovah, the Hierarchy under which the Jewish nation was born is, in their view, the highest of the seven Elohim.

Each nation, according to ancient Astrology, is born under the influence of one of the seven Sacred Planets—each of these planets being ensouled by, or being the dwelling place of, one of the seven Hierarchies or Elohim. The planet under which any nation is born remains throughout the lifetime of that nation *its ruling God.* And as each day of the week is held to be governed also by one of the seven planets, it is easy to understand how religious astrology possessed a strictly scientific foundation. Jehovah, ruler of the planet Saturn, rules also the last day of the week—Saturday—which became the Sabbath day of the Jews. Is it any wonder that the Christian nations, having adopted the Jewish tribal God as their own—thus ignoring the warning of Jesus about putting "new wine into old bottles"—find themselves for the past twenty centuries under the heavy yoke of the "Karma of Israel"?

The God of the Judeo-Christian tradition is widely accepted by the unthinking "multitudes" as being ever merciful, wholly just, and no respecter of persons. But it is a question whether these qualifications can be supported either by Scripture or by those events in Great Nature and in life which are sometimes called "the acts of God." Hurricanes and tornadoes rush in and engulf both good and evil men alike. Earthquakes swallow up whole cities without respect to age, sex, or morality. And cataclysms of various kinds perform their work of destruction regardless of human pain or despair. Are these the doings of an "ever merciful" God?

If the mercy of the Lord "endureth forever," how is one to explain those numerous instances in the Bible of what appear to be outright cruelty, and even injustice—the very opposite oftentimes of mercy?

> And I will dash them one against another, even the fathers and the sons together, saith the Lord: I will not pity, nor spare, nor have mercy, but destroy them. (Jer. 13:14.)
>
> And I will not have mercy upon her children; for they be the children of whoredoms. (Hosea 2:4.)

It may be understandable that the *parents* in such cases should receive little or no mercy or pity—although even this is a question, inasmuch as those unfortunate mothers who take up this course of life are more often than not driven to it by some trust, by circumstance or environment, or by the society in which they live. But wherein lies the justice of showing neither mercy nor pity toward the innocent offspring of such parents, who, from no cause of their own, happen to be born to this lot? It may be true that the God of the Bible shows no mercy for waifs such as these, but *human* pity fortunately does—and thus provides foundling homes and bright sunny schools, where these souls may experience at least a little of the sweeter side of life.

If the God of the Jews and Christians is "no respecter of persons," how is one to understand those instances of nationalism in the Bible, as when the property and wealth of the Canaanites, for example, were given without compensation to the fleeing Israelites, who had done nothing to earn them?

> So the children [of Israel] went in and possessed the land, and thou [the Lord] subduest before them the inhabitants of the land, the Canaanites, and gavest them into their hands, with their kings, and the people of the land, that they might do with them as they would.
>
> And they [the children of Israel] took strong cities, and a fat land, and possessed houses full of goods, wells digged, vineyards, and oliveyards and fruit trees in abundance; so they did eat, and were filled, and became fat, and delighted themselves in thy great goodness. Nevertheless, they [the Israelites] were disobedient . . . (Neh. 9:24-5.)

From the point of view of the disobedient Israelites, the "goodness" of the Lord must have seemed "great" indeed! Few individuals stop to question, however, how these actions of the Jewish God must have appeared in the eyes of the unfortunate Canaanites. How could these people, who had, no doubt, worked long and hard for the cultivation of their farms and cities, be made to understand that the hand of the Lord is the hand of "mercy"? Nehemiah says nothing at all about this. He does say, however, that because of continued perversity, the Jews were finally delivered into the hands of their enemies—the implication being that if these disobedient people had been a little less rebellious, the Lord might have allowed them to stay on in this "fat land," with the rightful owners as their slaves! In any event, the welfare of the Canaanites seems not to have been

even worthy of the consideration of the Lord—lending support to the Theosophical teaching that the God of the Old Testament was a *tribal deity,* one of the lesser gods, whose concerns were only those of the Jews.

How we have been able for so many centuries to reconcile such obvious partisanship, such cruel aggression and disregard for the welfare of others, with a kind and merciful God, is a mystery difficult to comprehend. Once grant that the God of Israel is one of the Elohim or lesser Gods—distinct from the Supreme DEITY—the history of the Jews as given in the Bible becomes comprehensible. But to roll all the different Gods, Hierarchies, and Elohim into *One Supreme Deity,* as the translators of the Hebrew texts have done—and then fasten upon that Supreme every act of national pride and vengeance, is a blasphemy against the Most High, destroying whatever of beauty and consistency the Bible possesses, and at the same time justifying ambitious national aggrandizement everywhere. Who can deny that the war-like spirit of Western nations has been inspired by the Lord God of Israel? Did he not plunder the lands of Sihon, Heshbon, Bashan and Canaan? Did he not take possession of the farms and vineyards they had labored to cultivate? Did he not destroy their kings and requisition their goods? If a good and merciful God does with justice all these things, why should not the leaders of modern nations do the same? No, the God of Israel can hardly lay claim to the title of the Most High Deity, nor does the Bible enumeration of his actions support the generally accepted belief that his mercy endureth forever. There are countless ordinary human beings whose mercy and compassion exceed by far that of the Jewish tribal God.

But the question will be asked: Did not Jesus speak of his Father in Heaven, and did he not mean by this term the God of the Jews? At no place in either of the four Gospels does Jesus once mention the name "Jehovah"! Let those who would identify the Father of Jesus with the Lord God of Israel explain the strange sentences put in the mouth of Jesus by the author of the fourth Gospel during his disputes with the Pharisees. Jesus said:

> I know ye are Abraham's seed . . . I speak the things which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father. (John: 37-8.)

Jesus *the initiate* (or Jehoshua) did not recognize Jehovah, the Father of the Pharisees, nor did he worship any tribal or planetary

god besides his own "Father," whom he knew, and with whom he communed as every high initiate does, "Spirit to Spirit and Soul to Soul." The "merciful Father" of Jesus, who was *within* instead of *without,* had little in common, evidently, with the Lord God of Israel. Jesus referred to his own Higher Self—the Atman of the Hindus, which is the God above each individual Soul.

Does the Absolute Deity possess attributes, we ask again? Does God love and hate, feel pleasure, mercy, jealousy and revenge? Questions such as these, it may well be, are problems essentially internal for every man, problems no one can solve for another. Answers to questions about Deity probably depend more upon inward awakening than outward communication, upon an ever-growing awareness within one's self. But to aid the searcher in his quest for Truth, other questions, posed by many sages, may prove worthy of consideration: Does Space, sometimes held to be the physical plane symbol of Deity, possess any qualities? Can Space be said to be large or small, far or near, round or flat? Is it hot or cold, light or dark, serene or disturbed? Although container and sustainer of everything—things desirable only in terms of the qualities—does Space Itself possess any of them? Can God be less than Space?

Does white light possess any color? Or does color come into being only when the unqualified rays of that light manifest through objects?

Is the sun hot, and does it emit light? Or are both light and heat by-products of the earth, having no existence before the impersonal rays of solar energy enter the terrestrial atmosphere?

Parabrahm, or Absolute Consciousness, the Highest Deity, according to *The Secret Doctrine,* is ever Unconditioned. It is only through an instrument or vehicle of matter that It can well up as individual consciousness, or "I am I." None of the great teachers ascribe qualities to the Absolute, although all the qualities exist in IT. Our knowledge begins with differentiation, and all manifested objects, beings, or powers are only differentiations of the Great Unknown.

The author of an ancient *Upanishad,* whose lamp shone brighter, perhaps, and whose gaze penetrated far more deeply into the soul of things than is achieved by the careless and the superficial, must have pondered long and searchingly the questions concerning the nature of the One Unchanging REALITY, or God. He said:

> The Spirit sees not; yet seeing not, he sees. For the energy that dwells in sight cannot cease, because it is everlasting. But there is no other besides the Spirit, or separate from him, for him to see.

Subsequent verses relate that although the Spirit smells not, speaks not, tastes not, hears not, thinks not, touches not, and knows not—he nevertheless does all these things, since the energy that dwelt in them is everlasting. Only, being in a condition of absolute UNITY and oneness with the Whole, there is no one, or no thing, on the outside to speak to, or hear, or know. Here is an exercise in metaphysical subtlety seldom reached in Western philosophic thought. Yet, it is a position to which the reflective mind must come if it is to grapple successfully with the subject of our discussion.

Is it possible that, just as the seven colors of the spectrum all have their source in the one White Light, which is no color; and as light, heat, moisture, cohesion, magnetism, and electricity, being correlations on the earth plane, all have their source in the one unmodified Solar Energy—so likewise, perhaps, are human love, mercy, justice, envy, greed and hatred but "refractions" and "correlations," earth-bound representations, in fact, of an underlying Unity? Logic would certainly seem to suggest as much.

But what, the question will be asked, is the nature and quality of that Unity? Can it be known to the mind of man? Is it a Force, a Principle, a Law, a Being—or is it Consciousness itself, pure and unadulterated? Whatever it may be, its one, never-changing nature, which is said to be "no attribute," is LOVE—called by William Q. Judge "the master of life." "For pure divine love," said H. P. Blavatsky, "is not merely the blossom of a human heart, but has its roots in eternity. Spiritual holy love is immortal . . . has a magic and divine potency . . . and is not limited by space and time."

> The more thou dost become at one with it [Alaya's Self], thy being melted in its BEING, the more thy Soul unites with that which IS, the more thou wilt become COMPASSION ABSOLUTE. (*The Voice of the Silence.*)

THE THEOSOPHY OF THE UPANISHADS

THE concept of detachment from bondage to material things has two connotations, depending on whether the frame of reference is religious or philosophical. If the disciple is to escape this bondage only when he has passed beyond the necessity for further incarnations, detachment results from a change in conditions or environment. Both heaven and nirvana symbolize this liberating transfer, and after it has been accomplished the soul no longer, presumably, faces the worries of the world. Speaking philosophically, however—and this is the language of the *Upanishads*—detachment is simply a word to indicate the necessity for bringing the full powers of the soul to focus upon our present existence. The transition from attachment to non-attachment means a change in one's state of being, rather than a change in environment; and so philosophical detachment may have a great deal to do with the increase of ethical awareness. For example, when we become impersonal in respect to the projected fulfillment of one or another personal desire, it is possible to consider other human beings impersonally also—to see them as ends in themselves, rather than as means to our own ends.

This is the view implied in the *Brihad Upanishad,* especially by one memorable passage: when the soul knows itself to exist in the timeless state, as well as in the state of space-time, when the spirit is "wrapped around by the soul of inspiration," there is a penetration behind the images of self:

> Here the father is father no more; nor the mother a mother nor the worlds, worlds; here the scriptures are no longer scriptures; the thief is a thief no more; nor the murderer a murderer; nor the outcast an outcast; nor the baseborn, baseborn; the pilgrim is a pilgrim no longer, nor the saint a saint. For the Spirit of man is not followed by good, he is not followed by evil. For he has crossed over all the sorrows of the heart.

A further passage makes it completely clear that this sort of enlightenment shines upon the everyday path of life:

> Then the point of the heart grows luminous, and when it has grown luminous, it lights the soul upon its way. Then his wisdom and works take him by the hand, and the knowledge gained of old.

The "soul," then, proceeds through a series of progressive awakenings. A contemporary psychologist (Herbert Fingarette in *The Self in Transformation*) finds an especially suggestive meaning in this upanishadic description of the transition from one earth life to another, with the results of experience refined by the fruit of contemplation:

> Then as a caterpillar when it comes to the end of a leaf, reaching forth to another foothold, draws itself over to it, so the soul, leaving the body, and putting off unwisdom, reaching another foothold there, draws itself over to it.

This emphasis on reincarnation characterizes the *Upanishads*. Attention is *not* focused upon the rewards or punishments which may occur in a future life and are therefore regarded as pleasant or unpleasant from the perspective of the present personality. The *Brihad Upanishad* continues:

> According as were his works and walk in life, so he becomes. As they said of old: Man verily is formed of desire; as his desire is, so is his will; as his will is, so he works; and whatever work he does, in the likeness of it he grows.

We are therefore able to appreciate why, in the *Katha Upanishad,* Death can be regarded as a teacher. The king's son, Nachiketas, is not satisfied with the ceremonial approach to the higher life as represented by his father, the king. And he rejects the assumption that the performance of certain acts and the non-performance of others will bring enlightenment and salvation, so he accepts "Death" as his teacher—and begins to learn that unless one constantly embraces death of his own foreshortened views and prejudices, unless he is able to accept the dissolution of any environmental situation, he has not discovered "the timeless Self." Sacrifices, in other words, are incidental to self-realization—which means the recognition that every man is noëtic as well as psychic, is both of "this world" and the "other world":

> The knower is never born nor dies, nor is it from anywhere, nor did it become anything. Unborn, eternal, immemorial, this ancient is not slain when the body is slain.
>
> If the slayer thinks to slay it, if the slain thinks it is slain, neither of them understand; this slays not nor is slain. Smaller than

> small, greater than great, this Self is hidden in the heart of man. Though seated, it travels far; though at rest, it goes everywhere.

These are basic comprehensions for any philosophy of a transcendental nature; and we find a clear expression of the upanishadic spirit in Emerson. A characteristically Emersonian passage is suggestive here:

> The soul gives itself, alone, original and pure, to the Lonely, Original and Pure, who, on that condition, gladly inhabits, leads, and speaks through it. Then it is glad, young, and nimble. Behold, it saith, I am born into the great, the universal mind. I, the imperfect, adore my own perfect. I am somehow recipient of the great soul, and thereby I do overlook the sun and the stars, and feel them to be the fair accidents and effects which change and pass. More and more the surges of everlasting nature enter into me, and I become public and human in my regards and actions. So I come to live in thoughts, and act with energies, which are immortal.

The Western and Eastern "Self"

There is considerable difference between our Western conception of Self and the Eastern conception of Atman. For the East the supreme ground of Being, Atman, is suprapersonal and completely transcendent, rendering its possessor capable of maintaining an attitude of selfless non-attachment to all wishes or compulsions of the ego. The Western Self, in contrast, is personal as well as impersonal. Through the ego it is attached to life in a meaningful and fateful way, while its transcendent aim relates it to the higher goal of individual differentiation from collective social patterns. In this sense individuation, therefore, involves the experience of conflict between the claims of the ego and the claims of the self.

—*The Wisdom of the Serpent*

YOUTH FORUM

Far beneath the anxious or the smiling surface of our normal lives, so far indeed sometimes that we ourselves do not suspect it, there exists in many of us (not all, no doubt, for some of us must be sane) a kind of disaffection, a dark and subtle self-contempt. But if men are really immortal, and potential gods, as Theosophy has declared, why should such feelings exist at all—or at any rate, why so deeply?

(*Concluded*)

"Who has twisted us like this?" cries the exquisite German poet, Rilke, and in one unscientific phrase focuses and elegizes the unique agony of modern man: a being lost in a labyrinth of his own construction, knowing too much to believe in the simple religious threads which were supposed to have led him back to paradise, yet at the same time knowing so little that he can scarce bear looking at his own ignorance in the mirror every morning. Man, feeling himself jilted by divinity, "left standing alone all day on the beach," turns in jealous hatred away from life, and runs with the hatred of lust after whores of diversion, comfort, entertainment, or even, sometimes, education. But in all these things what he hates most is himself, what he runs towards is his death.

A solution, suggested last month, is the simple one of "living," of letting life happen before our sentient eyes, and trying, by the basic adamic act of being conscious, to discover (and thus endow) meaning to all things. But is "living" enough? Put differently, is there more to living than just spectating, or appreciating? Clearly, there is more. There is sacrifice. H. P. Blavatsky calls it the law of life, and certainly we can see at least that it is the process of life. The mysterious crucifixion of every human being's incarnation into flesh must surely be considered a sacrifice, as well as a privilege, as must even our many (and often selfish) self-deprivations for the sake of some future "good." And even the empathetic act of seeing—as opposed to the passivity of mere spectating—involves a real and seldom recognized sacrifice, for in a deep sense it is possible to say, "I am not I when I see." I am momentarily robbed of myself, and am

at the same time somehow enriched, as though discovering in the ocean or painting or person in front of me new aspects of myself unknown before.

But sacrifices are seldom pleasant things. The infant screams in protest at his birth, and the passage from adolescence to parenthood is often painful. Yet, conversely, most of us, it seems, live out our lives disconsolately and safely because we recoil from some never-spoken-of and yet ultimate sacrifice of attitude that might have made us gods. Call it, if you will, the sacrifice hinted at as early as the third century by St. Augustine, when he said that it is not within man's power to determine when Grace will be accorded him, or how, or even if the Grace should come; but to be always prepared to *receive* that Grace, to remain in a taut state of readiness —that and that alone *is* within his power. But it must not be imagined that this Grace, or Satori, or foretaste of Initiation, is easy to prepare for, even if we had the prerequisite moral credentials, since the aspiration and courage required must stand tests as harrowing as climbing a mountain in a rainstorm and then standing naked at the top, waiting for lightning to strike!

It's a lot easier not to try at all. The trouble is, though, that it is sometimes difficult to avoid trying. The ancient myths have been with us for too long—that of the Phoenix renewed through fire, of Jason searching for the fleece, of Jacob wrestling the angel, of Job on his ash-heap challenging the Deity to appear and instruct him. All these are myths of resistance; they portray man resisting the forces of inertia within himself and the forces of nature outside, just as the filament in a bulb resists the current, and in the process produces light. Paradoxically, therefore, it is one's resistance to the "life force" which brings about a constructive union with that force, one's reaching towards the gods which makes one truly a man.

We cannot know exactly what happened during the earliest of the Grecian rites, nor what the steps in their general degradation were, nor the stages of their great subsequent upswing and sublimation into the titanic art of tragedy. But we can say what generally does happen, and may still be happening, when the soul's deep beneficent impulse towards self-sacrifice and self-surrender becomes dislocated, and grounded in physical actions and concerns. To put our suspicions more bluntly, there seems to be a tendency imbedded in our society (especially noticeable in cities), a sort of unspoken undercurrent, traversed and partially counteracted by a number of con-

structive cross-currents, but one which seems nonetheless to be gathering strength and which can only be described as evil. Call it a tendency to regulate our "readiness for life" to others—a tendency, for instance, to search out heroes, not in order to emulate them, but to use them as wish-fulfillments, as substitutes for actions on our own—a tendency, too (on the other side of the coin), to search out anti-heroes, the ordinary Joes of our world, perhaps in order to reassure ourselves that our own mediocrity is normal, commendable even, and that we need reach no higher in life than to the aerial of our second TV. All this represents a single tendency, at once a trend towards over-intellectuality and anti-intellectuality; that is to say, an almost total reliance on intellect for all the comforts we hold dear, yet a reliance which is almost totally centered upon the intellects of others—of specialists, of scientists, of political experts. We read, for example, in the New York *Herald Tribune* (Sept. 1) over breakfast, that "Life, say the scientists, is essentially protein molecules—long chains, lumpy balls and curlicues that collectively make muscle and brain, virus coats and bacteria tails, antibodies and hormones," but we seldom make an effort to inform ourselves well enough, or to meditate deeply enough to effectively fight such a verdict against "spiritual reality," and take it to higher courts of appeal.

What twists us into such passivity? It is our fear, a fear of being cut down by criticism, fear therefore springing from pride, and equally from feelings of inferiority—a deep self-love and a deep self-hatred existing simultaneously in our hearts because we secretly think ourselves separate from the rest of life.

But do we see where this is leading us? After all, tendencies are by definition not stationary. The conjecture of this student is that the ultimate degradation is not destruction, but in a perverse delight in destruction—in other words, *this* is evil. For when the soul's innate urge towards self-sacrifice becomes twisted by separativeness, the urge remains, only it becomes destructively self-centered, just as the expression through procreation of the life instinct, or love, when twisted to lust, becomes a vehicle of the death instinct, and is often accompanied by hatred or disgust.

It seems strange that it should be easier, even in the short run, to work against the laws of nature than to work with them, but it nevertheless appears that evil is in one sense the easy way out, for no matter how active its machinations, it reflects an implicit moral passivity —and it is for this reason that many of life's cowards will turn to an

evil, which will eventually destroy them, before they will turn to the courage that would save them and everyone else. Sometimes it is just the courage of simple, large-hearted laughter that is needed, and yet for some that seems a harder sacrifice to make than accepting the warping of their personality, for it requires an honest, "daylight" view of the world, a clarity of perspective which allows all the humorous incongruities (even those within oneself) to be openly recognized. It is fear that furnishes the nocturnal world of the neurotic, for in that half-seen world (half-seen because one eye is always lovingly on oneself), one is able to assume himself to be the central and most important point in the universe, and be "omnipotent" as far as the eye (his eye) can see.

Thus, as mentioned earlier, it is real seeing that involves a sacrifice. It lets the world in. It shifts the fulcrum of existence from ourselves to the Self of All. It destroys us and yet holds out the only hope of our salvation, for it involves a sharp joy, a meeting of the world heart-on, to discover that sight itself can be communion.

Philosophy and Moral Judgment

We have no right to assign for the actions of our neighbor any other motives than those which ought in similar circumstances to guide our own. But because *we* are not able to discern the processes of thought, to see the soul—it were very ridiculous to doubt or deny that any beings can. It is not incredible that the thoughts of the mind are the subjects of perception to some beings, as properly as the sounds of the voice, or the motion of the hand are to us. Indeed, every man's feeling may be appealed to on this question, whether the idea, that other beings can read his thoughts, has not appeared so natural and probable, that he has checked sometimes a train of thoughts that seemed too daring or indecent, for any unknown beholders to be trusted with.

—Emerson

LEMURIA

THE name Lemuria is an invention of P. L. Sclater, who asserted, between 1850 and 1860, on zoological grounds the actual existence, in prehistoric times, of a Continent which he showed to have extended from Madagascar to Ceylon and Sumatra. According to *The Secret Doctrine,* Lemuria, which served as the cradle of the Third Root Race, not only embraced a vast area in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, but extended in the shape of a horseshoe past Madagascar, round "South Africa" (then a mere fragment in the process of formation), through the Atlantic up to Norway. Africa, as a continent, was never part and parcel of either Lemuria or Atlantis. But Sweden and Norway formed part and parcel of ancient Lemuria, also of Atlantis on the European side, it is said. Lemuria was not submerged as Atlantis was, but was *sunk* under the waves, owing to earthquakes and subterranean fires, as Great Britain and Europe will be one day.

Just as in the case of Race-evolution, so in that of the shifting and re-shifting of continental masses, no hard and fast lines can be drawn where a new order ends and another begins. Continuity in natural processes is never broken. The first continent which came into existence capped over the whole North Pole like one unbroken crust, and remains so to this day. During the Second Race more land emerged from under the waters as a continuation of the "head" from the neck, down to a latitude of what is now roughly Greenland, and Eastern and Western Siberia. This broke asunder and disappeared. In the early part of the Third Race, Lemuria was formed. When it was destroyed in its turn, Atlantis appeared.

As the early root races must remain beyond the comprehension of minds trained in Western thought, it is found useless to speak in detail of the First and Second, and even of the Third in its earliest stage. It would be impossible to attempt, within the compass of even several volumes, a consecutive and detailed account of the evolution and progress of the first three races, except so far as to

---

NOTE.—A student's collation from the writings of H. P. Blavatsky.

give a general view of it. Race the First had no history of its own. Of race the Second the same may be said. One has to begin with the Third, when it reached its full human period, lest the uninitiated reader should find himself hopelessly bewildered. But Third Race mankind is the most mysterious of all the hitherto developed five Races. It was by the end of the 5th sub-race only that mankind was born under the same conditions and by the same identical process as our historical generations. From its early stage, to that time, required "millions of years" for the transformation.

The Third Root Race shows three distinct divisions or aspects physiologically and psychically: the earliest, sinless; the middle portions awakening to intelligence; and the third and last decidedly *animal,* i.e., *Manas* succumbs to the temptations of Kama. The Third Race were Hermaphrodites until the fall, or separation of the sexes into male and female. It is only at the mid-point of the Third Root Race that man was endowed with *Manas.*

Each class of Creators endows man with what it has to give: the one builds his external form; the other gives him its essence, which later on becomes the Human *Higher Self* owing to the *personal exertions* of the individual. The first Dhyanis, commissioned to "create" man in their image, could only throw off their shadows, like a delicate model for the Nature Spirits of matter to work upon. Man is, beyond any doubt, formed physically out of the dust of the Earth, but his creators and fashioners were many. During its childhood, mankind was composed wholly of the Angelic Host, who were the indwelling Spirits.

Tradition speaks of an Island inhabited by the last of the Sons of will and Yoga of the Third Race, who with a few tribes escaped the cataclysm. In *Isis* it is stated that "This race could live with equal ease in water, air, or fire, for it had an unlimited control over the elements. These were the 'Sons of God'—they who became the divine Instructors of men and imparted Nature's most weird secrets, and revealed the ineffable and now *lost* 'word'." That "Island," according to belief, exists to the present hour, somewhere in the Gobi Desert. There are traditions and chronicles of such dynasties of *divine* Kings—of gods reigning over men followed by dynasties of Heroes or Giants—existing in the annals of every nation. This accounts for the fact that peoples separated by oceans, possess the same "fairy-tales" in the same order of events. It is these Beings who appear first as "gods" and Creators; then they merge in

nascent man, to finally emerge as "divine-Kings and Rulers." But this fact has been gradually forgotten. The Lemuro-Atlanteans were the first who had a dynasty of *Spirit*-Kings, actual living *Devas* (or demi-gods or Angels) who had assumed bodies to rule over them, and who in their turn, instructed them in the arts and sciences.

In the first or earlier portion of the existence of this Third Race, while it was yet in its state of purity, the "Sons of Wisdom," who incarnated in this Race, produced by Kriyasakti a progeny called the "Sons of Will and Yoga," and by other names. The account speaks of "the Initiator and a group of semi-divine and semi-human beings, set apart for certain purposes. They are those in whom are said to have incarnated the highest Dhyanis from previous Manvantaras, to form the nursery for future human adepts, on this earth, and during the present cycle." The Third Race had thus created the so-called Sons of Will and Yoga, or the "ancestors" (the *spiritual* forefathers) of all the subsequent and present Arhats, or Mahatmas, in a truly *immaculate* way. They were indeed *created,* not *begotten,* as were their brethren of the Fourth Race, who were generated sexually after the separation of the sexes, the *Fall of Man.*

The "Fall of the angels," was due to their rebellion against Karmic Law. The "fall of *man"* was no fall at all, *for he was irresponsible.*

The reader must remember that of the Hosts of Dhyanis, whose turn it was to incarnate as the *Egos* of the immortal, but *on this plane senseless* monads—some "obeyed" (the law of evolution) immediately when the men of the Third Race became physiologically and physically ready, i.e., when they had separated into the sexes. These were those early conscious Beings who, now adding conscious knowledge and will to their inherent Divine purity, *created* by *Kriyasakti* the semi-Divine man, who became the seed on earth for future adepts.

Those, on the other hand, who, jealous of their intellectual freedom (unfettered as it then was by the bonds of matter), said—"We can choose . . . we have wisdom," and incarnated far later—these had their first Karmic punishment prepared for them. They got bodies physiologically inferior to their astral models, because their *chhayas* had belonged to progenitors of an inferior degree in the seven classes. As to those "Sons of Wisdom" who had "deferred" their incarnation till the Fourth Race, which was already tainted (physiologically) with sin and impurity, they produced a

terrible cause, the Karmic result of which weighs on them to this day.

The Third Race FELL—and created no longer; it *begat* its progeny. Being still mindless at the period of the separation it begot, moreover, anomalous offspring, until its physiological nature had adjusted its instincts in the right direction. It "begot from large females of the animal kingdom the anthropoids. . . ." But this "unnatural union in the Third Race, when man had not yet the light of *Manas* given to him, was not a crime against nature, since, no mind being present save in the merest germ, no responsibility could attach." Like the "lords the gods" of the Bible, the "Sons of Wisdom," the Dhyan-Chohans, had warned them to leave alone the fruit forbidden by Nature: but the warning proved of no value. Men realized the unfitness—we must not say sin—of what they had done, only when too late: after the angelic monads from higher spheres had incarnated in, and endowed them with understanding. To that day they had remained simply physical, like the animals generated from them.

There is a period of a few millions of years between the first "mindless" race and the highly intelligent and *intellectual* later "Lemurians." That Third and holy Race consisted of men who, at their zenith, were described as "towering giants of godly strength and beauty, and the depositaries of all the mysteries of Heaven and Earth." That power, by which they first created, is just that which has since caused them to be degraded from their high status to the position of evil spirits, of Satan and his Host, created in their turn by the unclean fancy of exoteric creeds. It was by Kriyasakti, that mysterious and divine power latent in the will of every man, and which, if not called to life, quickened and developed by Yogi-training, remains dormant in 999,999 men out of a million, and gets atrophied.

There were men during the early geological periods, men and civilized nations, who under the guidance of their *divine* Rulers, built large cities, cultivated arts and sciences, and knew astronomy, architecture and mathematics to perfection. This primeval civilization did not, as one may think, immediately follow their physiological transformation. Between the final evolution and the first city built, many hundreds of thousands of years had passed. Yet, we find the Lemurians in their sixth sub-race building their first rock-cities out of stone and lava. One of such cities of primitive structure was built entirely of lava, some thirty miles west from

where Easter Island now stretches its narrow piece of sterile ground, and was entirely destroyed by a series of volcanic eruptions.

The "one-eyed" cyclopes, the giants fabled as the sons of Cœlus and Terra—three in number, according to Hesiod—were the last three sub-races of the Lemurians, the "one-eye" referring to the Wisdom eye; for the two front eyes were fully developed as physical organs only in the beginning of the Fourth Race. The adventures of Ulysses with the Cyclopes, in the *Odyssey,* is an allegorical record of the gradual passage from the Cyclopean civilization of stone and colossal buildings to the more sensual and physical culture of the Atlanteans, which finally caused the last of the Third Race to lose their all-penetrating *spiritual* eye—Ulysses being said to belong to the cycle of heroes of the Fourth Race.

Nearly all of the gods of Egypt, Greece and Phoenicia, as well as those of other Pantheons, are of a northern origin and originated in Lemuria, towards the close of the Third Race, after its full physical and physiological evolution had been completed. All the "fables" of Greece were built on historical facts, if that history had only passed unadulterated by myths to posterity. The Third Race was pre-eminently the bright shadow, at first, of the gods, whom tradition exiles on Earth after the allegorical war in Heaven; which became still more allegorical on Earth, for it was the war between spirit and matter. This war will last till the inner and divine man adjusts his outer terrestrial self to his own spiritual nature. Till then the dark and fierce passions of the former will be at eternal feud with his master, the Divine man. But the *animal* will be tamed one day, because its nature will be changed, and harmony will reign once more between the two as before the "Fall," when even mortal man was *created* by the Elements and was not born.

In the present all-material Fifth Race, the earthly Spirit of the Fourth is still strong in us. But we are approaching the time when the pendulum of evolution will direct its swing decidedly upwards, bringing Humanity back on a parallel line with the primitive Third Root Race in Spirituality.

on the lookout

Canadian Notes on ULT

An informative editorial column in *The Canadian Theosophist* for July-August describes the growth of the United Lodge of Theosophists in the busy province of Ontario. The successful "graduation" of a study group in the capitol city of Ottawa to regular Lodge obligations and status was mentioned in the ULT Letter for 1964; the *Canadian Theosophist* editors connect this development, quite properly, with a brief history of the only previous ULT center north of the border. As the *CT* story puts it:

> The United Lodge of Theosophists of London, Ontario, which since 1939 has maintained a centre in that city, has sold its property at 524 Dundas Street. Their first meeting at the new address was held on White Lotus Day, May 8th, when friends and members gathered to honour the Founder of the Theosophical Society, Madame Helena Petrovna Blavatsky.

Plans for the Future

The story continues:

> In due course, the London U.L.T. hopes to build their own Theosophy Hall with space not only for public meetings and study groups but also for Theosophy School for the children, which is such an outstanding aspect of U.L.T. work throughout the world. A reference and lending library will be available to students of the University of Western Ontario, as well as the general public.
>
> The U.L.T. Study Group in Ottawa, which has been meeting weekly for a year, studying W. Q. Judge's *Ocean of Theosophy* and *The Bhagavad-Gita,* has now been granted a charter by the Province of Ontario. From now on, they will be known as the United Lodge of Theosophists of Ottawa, and will continue their study classes and reference and lending library facilities at 531 Bay Street in Ottawa.
>
> As most readers of *The Canadian Theosophist* know, the United Lodge of Theosophists is committed to the study and propagation of Theosophy as recorded in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge. Since its founding in 1909 by Robert Crosbie—a Montrealer who emigrated to the U.S.A.—

it has spread to many parts of the world revivifying the study of the original message delivered to H.P.B. by the Masters of the Wisdom for the century 1875-1975.

An Unusual Psychological Study

A paper in the *Journal of Social Issues* (October, 1962), by Henry A. Murray, discusses "The Personality and Career of Satan." Dr. Murray explains the "strangeness" of this subject for "serious consideration" by psychologists and sociologists, reminding them that his paper is the only one that the program committee did not have "the power to accept or reject"! He gives as reasons for his choice of subject:

> First, that more knowledge about the major determinants of human behavior is one of the prime aims of the science of psychology; second, that one class of major determinants of behavior consists of products of the imagination (imaginations regarding causes and consequences, for example), these being not infrequently more powerful than percepts in their effects on a person's physiology, mood, emotions, decisions, and overt actions; third, that among the countless dynamic products of the imagination over the last two thousand years, the concept, figure, and deeds of Satan have been singularly influential, apparently surpassing in awesome potency, during certain periods in certain areas, the concept, figure, and deeds of God; and fourth, since the amount of data bearing on the imagined personality and career of Satan down the ages is almost unique in volume and variety (my bibliography on the Devil consists of more than 150 titles), it would be hard to find a better case in which to test the plausibility of whatever hypotheses we may construct relative to the genesis, evolution, propagation, and survival of an enormously consequential inhabitant of the collective mind of Western man.

Basic Assumptions

The tendency of people to regard the "supernatural anthropopsychic beings" of mythologies and unfamiliar religions as "purely imaginary," while insisting that the *dramatis personae* of their own religious dramas have real and objective existence, results, Dr. Murray suggests, in an area of the psyche becoming enmeshed by sentiment, which is difficult to penetrate. To do so requires both determination to look for "truth" and courage to face it when revealed. Dr. Murray believes that the evidence set forth by Frazer and Freud "puts religion in the select company of science, philosophy, and art since these are also products of the best human imaginations revised by rationality." He continues:

> In fact, if one defines religion as *the* matter of ultimate concern, it gives religion the superordinate position. You can ask science for what? philosophy for what? and art for what? but not religion for what? because it is the function of religion to provide the best conceivable answers to all those "whats."
>
> To answer these "whats," to fulfill this basic function, as I see it, the propositions and stories of a religion should, first of all, be as true as they can be at any given time, that is, congruent with the deepest realities of human nature, and second, they should be as comprehensive and as self-consistent as they can be made; and third, they should comfort the distressed, and, by presenting visions of a realizable better future, engender hope, and encourage efforts to achieve this. Finally, a religious system should be applicable to the most critical problems of the day and aid in their solution, and hence, like science, should always be susceptible to correction and reconstruction.

Thus it would seem that psychologist Henry Murray concurs in the idea that "there is no religion higher than truth."

"Evolution" of a Symbol

In "The Personality and Career of Satan," Dr. Murray traces the evolution of the Devil idea from its first "projection of anthropo-psychic entities as powers immanent in natural objects" to the eventual focalization of all Good or Moral powers in God and all "evil" powers in Satan. He points out:

> "Satan" is a word which in the Old Testament means "the Adversary" (of man)—not a particular person with a proper name, but a role played by a number of angels (like FBI agents) in the service of Jehovah, who have access to Heaven, as we see in the book of Job, and are evidently on good terms with the Almighty.

H. P. Blavatsky makes a similar point in "The Fall of Ideals" (*Moral and Social Issues,* p. 23):

> Bereft of his theological and dogmatic attributes Satan is simply an *adversary;*—not necessarily an "arch fiend" or a "persecutor of men," but possibly also a foe of evil. . . . It is widely conceded that the *theological* Satan of the Fall is the "mind-born Son" of the blind poet [Milton].

"It is in the New Testament," says Dr. Murray, "that for the first time we encounter a fully formed and featured Satan, outcome of the non-canonical imaginings revised by rationality: a fallen angel of the first magnitude, the Evil One, with supernatural powers, the implacable enemy of God's promised kingdom for the righteous."

H.P.B. goes even further in her indictment (*S.D.* II, 377): "The New Testament, owing to its dogma of Satan and his rebellion, has belittled the character and nature of its would-be infinite, absolutely perfect god, and created the greatest evil and curse on earth—belief in a personal Devil."

Lucifer/Satan—a Psychological Analysis

The God/Satan idea, says Dr. Murray, is the dramatization of the Good Father/Bad Son relationship. "Formerly," he says, "perhaps from time immemorial," it was the custom to put all blame on the son. In the light of modern bias, however, it is more popular to blame the parent. Hundreds of parents, Dr. Murray notes, display more wisdom in dealing with a wayward and rebellious son than God did; for first He gave Lucifer the *capacity,* then denied him the RIGHT, to become God. This treatment caused resentment in Lucifer, which gradually became a hatred of the father-image, finally culminating in a "malignant hatred of the entire human race."

In considering the question, "Is the Spirit of Satan Operating in our Midst?" Dr. Murray suggests that it may have been the supreme triumph of Satan to *appear* to have been annihilated by the forces of Reason and Enlightenment. This left him free to work behind the scenes, to recuperate his forces, and, perhaps, to reappear as a "projection of man's self-destructive tendencies." Compare, for example, Mr. Judge's statement, "On this plane the dark powers rely upon their ability to create a maya," with this passage from Dr. Murray:

> We might reasonably surmise that the Devil's target in the case of pretty nearly the majority of men and women in the West consists of whatever dispositions and powers may reside in them to create conceptions of this nature: say, the conception of a better world composed of better societies of better persons and to strive to actualize it by self-transformations and social reconstructions. In other words, according to one tenable view, the Satanic aim is to prevent all developments in this direction by shattering man's faith in the existence of the necessary potentialities within himself and reducing him to cynicism and despair until the demoralization and abasement of his personality has reached a state beyond recovery and in one disgraceful debacle of genocidal fury he terminates the long history of his species.

Is Denigration of Man a Satanic Device?

Dr. Murray concludes:

> And here is where our psychology comes in with the bulk of its theories, its prevailing views of human personality, its images

of man, obviously in league with the objectives of the nihilist Satanic spirit. Man is a computer, an animal, or an infant. His destiny is completely determined by genes, instincts, accidents, early conditioning and reinforcements, cultural and social forces. Love is a secondary drive based on hunger and oral sensations or a reaction formation to an innate underlying hate. In the majority of our personological formulations there are no provisions for creativity, no admitted margins of freedom for voluntary decisions, no fitting recognitions of the power of ideals, no bases for selfless actions, no ground at all for any hope that the human race can save itself from the fatality that now confronts it. If we psychologists were all the time, consciously or unconsciously, intending out of malice to reduce the concept of human nature to its lowest common denominators, and were gloating over our successes in so doing, then we might have to admit that to this extent the Satanic spirit was alive within us. . . .

The Cosmic View

Dr. Murray's psychological study of the personality and career of Satan is enhanced by H. P. Blavatsky's philosophic and metaphysical treatment of the same subject. The following passage is from *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 389):

> Evil is a necessity in, and one of the supporters of the manifested universe. It is a necessity for progress and evolution, as night is necessary for the production of Day, and Death for that of Life—*that man may live for ever.*
>
> Satan represents metaphysically simply the *reverse or the polar opposite* of everything in nature. He is the "adversary," allegorically, the "murderer," and the great Enemy of *all,* because there is nothing in the whole universe that has not two sides—the reverses of the same medal. But in that case, light, goodness, beauty, etc., may be called Satan with as much propriety as the Devil, since they are the *adversaries* of darkness, badness, and ugliness.
>
> *There is no Devil, no Evil, outside mankind to produce a Devil.*

In the personal Luciferian drama, as Mr. Judge says in the Gita *Notes* (p. 30), "We take up the gage over and over, life after life, in experience after experience, never completely defeated if we always look to Krishna—our Higher Self."

The Scope of Evolution

Dr. Loren Eiseley's *The Immense Journey* discusses evolutionary theory with the philosophic breadth and poetic depth which has made many men of science natural allies of the theosophic perspective.

(Material of this volume first appeared in the *American Scholar, Harper's,* the *Scientific American,* and is now issued as a *Time* Reading Program Special Edition.) As a review in *Manas* says: "The title for this book by Loren Eiseley is a fitting one, especially if we know enough of Dr. Eiseley's temper of mind to understand that 'immensity' for him means something more than an infinitude of complications in the physical characteristics of material form, and refers as well to the depth and wonder of the unfolding of life on this planet. The chief wonder of all is, of course, man himself; and this is a sensible yet poetic development of the point of view adopted during the early days of the formulation of evolutionary theory by Alfred Russel Wallace, in opposition to what may be called the rather uncompromising 'materialism' of Charles Darwin."

A paragraph from a chapter titled "The Great Deeps" is typical of Dr. Eiseley's prose:

> Sometimes, walking in the star-sprinkled evenings, I think of that almost forgotten theory of Arrhenius that the spores of life came originally from outer space.
>
> Perhaps that explains it, I think wistfully—life reaching out, groping for a billion years, life desperate to go home.
>
> The nineteenth-century mechanists, at least, did not find our origins in the abyss, and every bubble of the chemist's broth has left the secret of life as inscrutably remote as ever. The ingredients are known; they are to be had on any drug-store shelf. You can take them yourself and pour them and wait hopefully for the resulting slime to crawl. It will not. The beautiful pulse of streaming protoplasm, that unknown organization of an unstable chemistry which makes up the life process, will not begin. Carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen, and oxygen you have mixed, and the same dead chemicals they remain.

Mysteries of the Human Brain

Dr. Eiseley is always concerned with encouraging "the most enormous extension of vision of which life is capable." A focus for the "expansionist" conception of the theory of evolution appears in his discussion of the human brain. In a chapter headed "Man of the Future," Dr. Eiseley writes:

> Those who contend that because of present human cranial size, and the limitations of the human pelvis, man's brain is no longer capable of further expansion, are mistaken. Cranial capacities of almost a third more than the modern average have been occasionally attained among the Boskop people and even in rare individuals among other, less foetalized races. The secret does

not lie in the size of the brain before birth; rather, as we have seen, it is contained in that strange spurt which in the first year of life carries man upward and outward into a social world from which his fellow beings are excluded. Whether that postnatal expansion is destined to be further enhanced in the long eras to come there is no telling, nor, perhaps, does it matter greatly. For in the creation of the social brain, nature, through man, has eluded the trap which has engulfed in one way or another every other form of life on the planet. Within the reasonable limits of the brain that now exists, she has placed the long continuity of civilized memory as it lies packed in the world's great libraries. The need is not really for more brains, the need is now for a gentler, a more tolerant people than those who won for us against the ice, the tiger, and the bear. The hand that hefted the ax, out of some old blind allegiance to the past fondles the machine gun as lovingly. It is a habit man will have to break to survive, but the roots go very deep.

Of Animals and Men

Dr. Eiseley quotes Dr. Tilly Edinger, of Harvard, who remarks that "the brain of *Homo Sapiens* has not evolved from the brains it is compared with by comparative anatomy; it developed within the Hominidae, at a late stage of the evolution of this family whose other species are all extinct." Dr. Eiseley continues:

> We can, in other words, weigh, measure and dissect the brains of any number of existing monkeys. We may learn much in the process, but the key to our human brain clock is not among them. It arose in the germ plasm of the human group alone and we are the last living representatives of that family. As we contemplate, however, the old biological law that, to a certain degree, the history of the development of the individual tends to reproduce the evolutionary history of the group to which it belongs, we cannot help but wonder if this remarkable spurt in brain development may not represent something roughly akin to what happened in the geological past of man—a sudden or explosive increase which was achieved in a relatively short period, geologically speaking. We have already opened this topic in our discussion of the Darwin-Wallace argument.

The Wonder of the "Final World"

Throughout *The Immense Journey* the reader is impressed by Dr. Eiseley's feeling for the oneness of life and consciousness inherent in forms far removed on the "evolutionary ladder." (Even fossils "come alive" under the spell of his imagination.) Evolution is not a mechanistic process, he feels, but a "reaching out" for fuller

and fuller expression. The deepest mystery of all, Dr. Eiseley believes, lies in the mysterious principle of "organization":

> Men talk much of matter and energy, of the struggle for existence that molds the shape of life. These things exist, it is true; but more delicate, elusive, quicker than the fins in water, is that mysterious principle known as "organization," which leaves all other mysteries concerned with life stale and insignificant by comparison. For that without organization life does not persist is obvious. Yet this organization itself is not strictly the product of life, nor of selection. Like some dark and passing shadow within matter, it cups out the eyes' small windows or spaces the notes of a meadow lark's song in the interior of a mottled egg. That principle—I am beginning to suspect—was there before the living in the deeps of water.
>
> No utilitarian philosophy explains a snow crystal, no doctrine of use or disuse. Water has merely leapt out of vapor and thin nothingness in the night sky to array itself in form. There is no logical reason for the existence of a snowflake any more than there is for evolution. It is an apparition from that mysterious shadow world beyond nature, that final world which contains—if anything contains—the explanation of men and catfish and green leaves.

The Shadow World

That there exists an explanation of the world beyond nature is suggested in theosophical teaching. The following, for example, from *The Ocean of Theosophy,* is relevant:

> The astral body is the guiding model for the physical one, and all the other kingdoms have the same astral model. Vegetables, minerals, and animals have the ethereal double, and this theory is the only one which will answer the question how it is that the seed produces its own kind and all sentient beings bring forth their like.